

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Santosh Prakash	Team: Squad #08	CCRB Case #: 201800448	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Friday, 01/12/2018 7:00 PM	Location of Incident: Inside of § 87(2)(b)	18 Mo. SOL 7/12/2019	Precinct: 114		
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 01/12/2018 7:57 PM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 01/18/2018 11:05 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Torab Chowdhury	03384	946859	PSA 9
2. POF Sima Monroe	21949	947266	PSA 9

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POF Sima Monroe	Abuse: Police Officer Sima Monroe threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM Torab Chowdhury	Abuse: Police Officer Torab Chowdhury threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Case Summary

On January 12, 2018, the CCRB received the following case from IAB.

On January 12, 2018, at 7:30 pm, at § 87(2)(b) in Queens, PO Torab Chowdhury and PO Sima Monroe allegedly threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations A, B: Abuse of Authority – Threat of Arrest: § 87(2)(g)**) The incident did not result in a summons or arrest and there is no relevant video documentation.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A: Police Officer Sima Monroe threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

Allegation B: Police Officer Torab Chowdhury threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

The following facts are undisputed. On January 12, 2018, between the hours of 3:30 pm and 7:30 pm, § 87(2)(b) called 911 on four separate occasions to request police assistance with an ongoing dispute involving a neighbor. PO Chowdhury and PO Monroe responded to all but one of these calls, including the very last one at 7:32 pm. (BR01-BR05) In dispute is whether the officers threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) during their last interaction.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that she called 911 to report that her neighbor, in the course of a verbal altercation earlier that afternoon, had threatened to assault her. When they responded to the first call, PO Chowdhury and PO Monroe allegedly refused to generate a complaint against the neighbor and left the scene after advising § 87(2)(b) to avoid interacting with the neighbor. When PO Chowdhury and PO Monroe responded to her second 911 call a short time later, the officers conveyed the same thing and again left without taking a report. Another unit responded to her third call and advised her to file a report at the PSA2 stationhouse. Allegedly, when PO Chowdhury and PO Monroe responded to her fourth and final call, they told § 87(2)(b) that she “can’t keep calling the cops,” jointly threatened to arrest her if she called again, and left without further providing any further assistance. (BR01)

PO Chowdhury’s and PO Monroe’s memo book entries reflected the following: the first call, at 3:40 pm, was closed as “non-crime” at 4:05 pm; the second call, at 4:38 pm, was also closed as “non-crime” at 4:48 pm; at 5:05 pm, Sgt. Anthony Bruno, the patrol supervisor, responded to the third call and closed it as “non-crime” also; PO Chowdhury and PO Monroe responded to the final call at 7:32 pm and closed it at 7:42 pm as a “90Y” or “unnecessary” job. (BR04) The event documents corroborate this timeline. (BR05)

PO Chowdhury testified that he was familiar with § 87(2)(b) having dealt with her on similar “non-crime” jobs in the past. PO Chowdhury stated that § 87(2)(b) never asked them to take a complaint on the incident date and only wanted to air general grievances regarding her neighbor. He recalled few substantive details regarding the first two jobs and believed that when the officers responded to her final call, § 87(2)(b) just walked back into the building upon realizing

that it was him and PO Monroe again. The operator's call-backs to § 87(2)(b) went un-answered and the officers ended up leaving the scene. (BR02)

PO Monroe, who recalled more of the incident, acknowledged that the officers were unable to act on § 87(2)(b)'s demand that they generate a complaint because she did not describe anything, generally or specifically, that amounted to a threat or harassment. Per PO Monroe, the officers spent a significant period of time explaining this to § 87(2)(b) during their first visit and ultimately left, realizing that § 87(2)(b) was unhappy. When they visited the second time, § 87(2)(b) met them outside the building but refused to deal with them, requesting a supervisor instead. Patrol Supervisor Sgt. Bruno later informed her that he had responded and closed the job as "non-crime." Per PO Monroe, the officers responded to § 87(2)(b)'s final call at about 7:30 pm, but could not find her outside the building or in the lobby, and left the scene without further interaction after the operator's call-backs were unsuccessful. (BR03)

PO Chowdhury and PO Monroe both testified that they responded to each of § 87(2)(b)'s 911 calls that day with the same degree of professional obligation, and that they never threatened her with arrest at any time. The officers did not believe that § 87(2)(b)'s repeated 911 calls constituted an arrestable offense. (BR02-BR03)

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) has been a party to two prior CCRB complaints § 87(2)(b)
- PO Chowdhury has been a member of service for 9 years: during this time, he has been a subject in one prior complaint, on four allegations, all unfounded. § 87(2)(g)
- PO Monroe has been a member of service for 9 years: she has never been a subject in a CCRB complaint.

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

§ 87(2)(b) rejected mediation. Notice of claim results are pending. § 87(2)(b) [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(g)]

Squad No.: 08

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date